

that is restricted in this way. After July 1, spending cannot exceed 6.7 percent per month of the total appropriated, which means that only a small amount of the whole will actually be spent before Oct. 1, when a new fiscal year begins.

Daulaire projects that as many as 5,000 more women will die over the next year as a result of unsafe abortions and mistimed pregnancies, and that roughly 500,000 additional births will result, putting further stress on child-survival programs that are strained already. Further, he says, the piecemealing restrictions imposed by Congress will increase administrative costs by four to five times, costing U.S. taxpayers \$750,000 to \$1 million more.

Most of the campaign against family planning has been carried out in the guise of preventing U.S. foreign aid funds from paying for abortions, although that practice has been banned since 1973. This current fight began last year when House Republicans voted for a measure sponsored by Rep. Christopher H. Smith (R-N.J.) that would have prevented any foreign nongovernmental organization from receiving any U.S. family-planning money if it attempted to provide information about abortion or lobby its own government to change regulations regarding abortion. The Senate refused to go along with the Smith language, the White House said it would veto any bill with this language, and a stalemate on the whole foreign aid package ensued.

Pressure to get a foreign operations appropriation bill mounted steadily after Oct. 1, when checks to Israel and Egypt weren't delivered, foreign aid missions weren't getting their funding, their contractors weren't being paid and population programs weren't being funded at all, according to Victoria Markell, vice president of Population Action International, a nonprofit, research-based advocacy organization that receives no federal funding.

The Smith language was cut out of the final bill last Thursday in the face of growing public outrage over the prospect of yet another government shutdown. "The ideologues had to come up with some formulation that will restrict population-planning spending as much as they could," Markell says. Neither the Senate nor the White House wanted the blame for another government shutdown.

"It's such an attack on women and children," Markell says. "How in the world can you pretend to care about child survival when we know that women and mothers are going to die without access to family planning?" She cites a World Health Organization statistic that 90 percent of children in developing countries who lose their mothers in delivery will die by their first birthday. "We know that if women have fewer children, the children they have live longer and are healthier and everyone benefits."

"One of the key priorities of our family-planning program is to reduce abortions worldwide," Daulaire says. Yet, when it became clear that the Smith language gutting family-planning services would not pass, "they decided that the way to extract a cost was by severely restricting AID's ability to provide family-planning services around the world. They understood very clearly that this language would mean not just a 35 percent reduction in funding but was really much harsher."

What is clear from this exercise is that the conservative Christian bloc of House Republicans is targeting international contraceptive and family-planning services, not just abortion services. And the people who will suffer are women and children in the poorest parts of the world. Is that the Christian way?

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES A. WALTON,  
SR.

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1996

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following obituary appeared in the Indianapolis Star on February 20, 1996. It should have been delayed for at least 30 more years.

Charlie Walton was one of God's noblemen—undoubtedly still is now that he is in the arms of the Almighty for eternity.

Obituaries tend to be rather sterile. Just the facts. Here is another fact, Charlie Walton was one of the brightest and gentlest people who ever lived. His death leaves an enormously lonesome place in Indianapolis.

[From the Indianapolis Star, Feb. 20, 1996]

CHARLES WALTON SR., ATTORNEY, EX-CENTER TOWNSHIP TRUSTEE

Charles A. Walton Sr., 59, an Indianapolis attorney and former Center Township trustee, died Feb. 19.

Services will be at 1 p.m. Feb. 22 in Stuart Mortuary Chapel, with calling from 11 a.m.

Burial: Crown Hill Cemetery.

He was elected interim trustee in 1986 by Democratic precinct committeemen to fill the unexpired term of the late Benjamin Osborne. Mr. Walton, a controversial figure, subsequently was denied the nomination for a four-year term by party officials despite support from the precinct committeemen.

He was an attorney 36 years with several firms, including Walton and Pratt, which he helped start in 1992 with a daughter, a son and son-in-law.

Mr. Walton was elected to the Indiana General Assembly in 1964. He was also a former deputy prosecuting attorney for Marion County and an Indianapolis city attorney.

He was an unsuccessful candidate for mayor of Indianapolis in 1987.

He was a member of Metropolitan Baptist Church; National, American, Indiana, Indianapolis and Marion County bar associations; and a life member of the NAACP.

He was a graduate of Morehouse College and Indiana University School of Law, Indianapolis. Memorial contributions may be made to the Indianapolis Morehouse College Alumni Association Scholarship Fund, in care of Walton and Pratt law firm.

Survivors: wife Joan Blackshear Walton; children Charles A. Jr., John C. Walton, Mia-Lon Washington, Tanya Walton Pratt; sisters Adell Van Buren, Johnnie Marie Cliff; four grandchildren.

INTRODUCTION OF SAFE: THE SECURITY AND FREEDOM THROUGH ENCRYPTION ACT

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1996

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to introduce the Security and Freedom Through Encryption Act. The SAFE Act. Twenty-seven of my colleagues in the House join me as cosponsors of this important legislation. We join Senators LEAHY and BURNS in this bipartisan initiative which is intended to send the administration two loud and clear messages:

Our antiquated export restrictions are out of step with today's technology and must be brought into the information age; and

And American citizens and businesses will not tolerate big brother holding the keys to their private and proprietary information.

American consumers are demanding information security and are getting it. Without security features, the innovative content, electronic commerce, and enhanced communications capabilities necessary to make the development of the GII—global information infrastructure—a success simply will not occur. Current law allows Americans to utilize any level of encryption that innovative minds can develop, but the administration wants to change that. They want to use export controls as a back door approach to controlling the use of encryption here at home.

The administration has proposed allowing the export of products with strong security features but only if key escrow is built in. If this does not work, administration officials have said they will seek legislation forcing Americans to use only encryption to which the Government has access. We are here to tell the administration not to bother. We reject that solution as a big Government answer to a Big Government problem. It completely ignores consumer privacy and security.

While we recognize the concerns of law enforcement officials who want to preserve surveillance capabilities, the technology genie is clearly out of the bottle. The administrations' "64-bit key escrow" policy ignores the realities of today's marketplace and the technology which abounds. Criminals and terrorists are not always stupid, they are going to use the highest security to communicate and conspire that is technologically available. Terrorists will not buy American just because of it's PC.

There are currently over 500 foreign products and programs with strong encryption capabilities available in the world marketplace. These are products that U.S. companies can not even export. Some of them are here on display. These products are being produced and sold by foreign companies and can be downloaded on the Internet and used anywhere in the world.

An economic study released in December by the Department of Commerce demonstrates that failure to address these export controls by the year 2000—4 years from now—will cost the U.S. economy \$60 billion and 200,000 jobs. The administration's proposed policy would be yet another blow to the U.S. computer industry. It is time we gave our companies the ability to compete rather than giving foreign competitors the advantage.

Therefore, our bill will do four things:

Continue to ensure that all Americans have the right to choose any security system to protect their confidential information.

Prohibit big brother from mandating a back door into people's computer systems.

Make it unlawful to use encryption in the commission of a crime or to willfully coverup a crime.

Allow the U.S. computer industry to export generally available software and hardware if a product with comparable security is commercially available from foreign suppliers.

U.S. software companies, world leaders in cutting edge technology, must have the freedom to develop products with strong security features which meet computer user demands and privacy concerns in the United States and abroad. Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan effort that I urge of all my colleagues to join and support.